REMARKS

Claims 8-14 are currently pending in this application. This Amendment amends claims 8 and 14, and adds new claims 15 and 16 in accordance with the original disclosure. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at page 7, lines 26-31 and page 8, lines 11-28, in the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefano Zatti "Naming in OSI" (hereinafter "Zatti") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,520 to Want et al. (hereinafter "Want"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 8 and 14 are independent claims. Claims 8 and 14 have been amended. Support for all amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Zatti reference does not teach or suggest the present invention.

Independent claim 8 is directed to a method for providing unique URL/DNS definitions, i.e., codes created from commonly known pre-existing identification data. The method of identifying and registering applications based on pre-existing data addresses two well known problems of current URLs and Domain Names.

First, Domain Names contain little functional logic. In its best situation, a company has managed to get the domain name equivalent to its product or a person has managed to get a domain with their surname. However, to get a desired domain is the exception. At its best, even these domains convey very little functional information on the Internet. Even though you have found a domain with a surname in it, you have very low probability that the site is owned by the person for whom you search.

Second, domain names embody unsearchable strings. There are many causes for the lack of search ability. There is difficulty in translation by regional browsers and search engines caused by language and character problems. There is also limited space. There is only one URL with a certain domain name available within every ccTLD's, forcing people to choose further abstract domains, further limiting the searching capabilities of search engines.

The method of claim 8 solves these problems. More specifically, it allows users to quickly search Internet information in specific and also esoteric foreign entities. Additionally, it enhances knowledge exchange, and it greatly decreases expenditures in both time and money spent to find this knowledge.

Zatti

Zatti, the primary reference in all of the prior art rejections, discusses OI (Object Identifier) and DN (Distinguished Names). Zatti declares that DN is a robust system for naming at the user level because of its expressiveness but is limited particularly because of its redundancy. Furthermore, according to Zatti, an OI has the ability to store very specific information about an object in a Registration Authority Tree but its function is also limited because duplication would exist if it were to store instances of the object. According to Zatti, this duplication would be necessary to create the information needed for a system of searching. Zatti goes on to show that DNs are, therefore, important for defining administrative instances of objects. In the case of Directory Information Tree, made up of DNs, searching is much easier but does not give the important classification information found in a tree of OIs. OIs are important for registering objects but not for associating information about the objects they name.

Although the Zatti publication discusses the use of OI and DN and their possible advantages, Zatti provides no motivation to use pre-existing identification data in a structure, as in the presently claimed invention. According to Zatti, there exists a problem that cannot be solved by one system. In a Registration Authority Tree, each object is classified, thereby creating world unique identifiers to standard related objects. When the objects have been implemented and an object instance is physically created, a request is made for a DN for that instance and the instance is added to the Directory Information Tree (DIT). However, the descriptive information about the object defined in the Registration Authority Tree is not found in the DN. Instead, the definition is an administrative description of the object.

Want

Want appears to teach a system for naming web pages based on a certain location. The system names web pages with a URL, in some instances based on the global

positioning parameters. The word "name" has a wide range of meanings. In terms of the Want invention, it is used to describe "where." In Want, the system uses coordinates to build a web page, which has functional information describing where a building, business, or other object is located. In the present invention, name is used as an identifier to refer to persons that humans seek, wish to have access to, or communicate with; in other words, a name conveys a sense of "who" humans are talking about. Want teaches a method of finding objects at specific locations.

It is improper to combine references that teach away from their combination. If one was to take the teachings of Want literally and were to actually register geographic coordinates in order to establish a system of registering persons to solve the general problem as discussed above, it would not solve the problem. Want doesn't arrive at the claimed invention even if combined with the teachings of Zatti. For example, if you register every location on the planet, you still could not find nor identify a single person since, by their nature, people are not connected to locations. People are not static, they travel in and out of locations all of the time.

Both Zatti and Want teach away from pre-existing data that uses a defined structure for arriving at a system of domain names. Generally, they have argued that the data should be hidden from the user. Accordingly, references that teach away from the invention at hand lack the necessary motivation to combine and, thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would neither make the combination nor expect success.

Additionally, the motivation to combine the references is lacking. There is no relation between the Want system for naming URLs and the systems described in Zatti. As stated previously, Zatti discusses OI trees and DN trees, two systems that are relatively well known in the art. Each of the trees has a different function and operates effectively within its own space. Generally, both are registering authorities. Want teaches a system of naming web pages so that they can be accessed on a web server. Want's system is used for a system where some URLs are existing and some URLs are dedicated. Want does not suggest a means of registering these web pages so that they can be cross-referenced and searched on the Internet.

The present invention, as defined in the claims of the present application, is distinguishable from the URL naming system of Want and the system of Zatti. In particular and as specifically set forth in amended independent claim 8, the method of the present

invention defines a "structure and a defined system of pre-existing identification data stored in at least one database." The structure contains the pre-existing identification data and is operative to subdivide searches into different groups. This distinguishes the present invention from Want, which teaches a method of naming URLs. Want teaches only a method of naming and retrieving web pages. For example, Want builds a URL that has a component which identifies a location. Similar to the limitations of the example, distinguished names (DNs) discussed in Zatti, Want is limited in its URLs to mere coordinates. The present invention has solved the problem of translating "real world" identification data to DNs in Internet applications. With the present invention, a user can merely search the yellow pages or some other directory to find the URL or domain name they were searching. It would also store functional information as the entity including country and/or phone number.

The DNs of Zatti are a powerful method of naming. However, they do not provide pertinent details about the object on which can be used to provide a system capable of providing functional URLs capable of universal searching as in the present invention. Zatti also discusses OIs which contains valuable functional information but which cannot be integrated with DNs.

Claims 9-13, which depend from claim 8 and add further limitations thereto, are also deemed allowable over Zatti for the same reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 14 was amended to positively claim a structure and a defined system of pre-existing identification data stored in at least one database, where the structure contains the pre-existing identification data and is operative to subdivide searches into different groups. We respectfully ask for reconsideration of independent claim 14, which is a system claim of the same invention in independent claim 8.

The amendment adds new claims 15 and 16. Support for new claims 15 and 16 can be found on page 7, lines 26-31 and page 8, lines 1-28 and in the drawings. No new matter has been added. The prior art cited neither teaches nor suggests the features of new claims 15 and 16. Admittance and consideration of new claims 15 and 16 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections and allowance of pending claims 8-16 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By _____

John W. McIlvaine
Registration No. 34,219
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com